

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed October 31, 2008, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. To further the prosecution of this application, amendments have been made in the claims, and each of the rejections set forth in the Office Action has been carefully considered and is addressed below. The claims as presented are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-13, 15-20, 36 and 42-49 were previously pending in this application. Claims 1, 17 and 36 are amended. No claims are added or canceled. As a result, claims 1-13, 15-20, 36 and 42-49 remain pending for examination, with claims 1, 17 and 36 being independent. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Each of independent claims 1, 17 and 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as purportedly being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,442,714 to Griffin et al. (“Griffin”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,671,351 to Wild et al. (“Wild”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,143,103 to Zisman et al. (“Zisman”). Each of independent claims 1, 17 and 36 is amended herein, and patentably distinguishes over any combination of the asserted references.

As amended herein, each of independent claims 1, 17 and 36 includes limitations directed to obtaining information regarding use of at least one software product. A problem-reporting client is configured to construct a report user interface without requiring an initial connection to a server, and to, in response to a user of a particular client device entering information on a topic relating to the software product to the report user interface, load an additional report user interface definition file for collecting additional information on the topic. The problem-reporting client dynamically reconfigures the report user interface to collect the additional information on the topic based on the initial report user interface definition file, without communicating with the at least one server while reconfiguring.

Support for the amendments to each independent claim can be found in Applicant’s specification at, e.g., p.9, lines 1-23.

The Office Action relies upon Zisman to purportedly satisfy the limitations of the previously pending independent claims directed to a problem-reporting client. However, Zisman fails to disclose or suggest a problem-reporting client configured to, in response to a user of a particular client device entering information *on a topic relating to a software product* to a report user interface, load an additional report user interface definition file *for collecting additional information on the topic*, and to dynamically reconfigure the report user interface to collect *the additional information on the topic* based on the additional report user interface definition file, as required by each independent claim.

Rather, Zisman discloses a system for creating XML source documents which comply with formal consistency relationships defined by a set of consistency rules (col. 1, lines 53-57). As pointed out by the Office Action, in the system of Zisman, a user may add a consistency rule to those already stored by the system (col. 11, lines 21-23). When the user adds a new consistency rule, he/she is prompted to supply details on the new rule, and then to save the rule in memory (col. 11, lines 27-32). The Office Action adopts the position that the ability to add a new consistency rule in the system of Zisman is analogous to the claim limitations requiring loading an additional report user interface definition file based on information entered into a report user interface by a user of a client device. The Office Action contends that one skilled in the art would have been motivated to apply this capability taught by Zisman to the problem-reporting systems taught by Griffin and Wild, so that custom reports may be generated based on consistency rules added by a user.

Without acceding to the propriety of the asserted combination, each independent claim has been amended to clearly distinguish over any combination of the asserted references. Specifically, none of the asserted references say anything at all relating to, in response to a user of a particular client device entering information on a topic relating to a software product to a report user interface, loading an additional report user interface definition file for collecting additional information on the topic, and dynamically reconfiguring the report user interface to collect the additional information on the topic. Using the analogy applied by the Office Action to illustrate, Zisman says nothing at all about loading, in response to a user adding a new consistency rule applicable to various XML documents, an additional user interface definition file for collecting additional information on either

the consistency rule or the XML documents. Zisman thus necessarily fails to disclose or suggest dynamically reconfiguring a report user interface to collect the additional information on the consistency rule or XML documents.

Griffin and Wild fail to remedy this deficiency of Zisman, as neither asserted reference says anything at all relating to, in response to a user of a particular client device entering information on a topic relating to a software product to a report user interface, loading an additional report user interface definition file for collecting additional information on the topic, or dynamically reconfiguring the report user interface to collect the additional information on the topic.

Accordingly, each of independent claims 1, 17 and 36 patentably distinguishes over any combination of the asserted references, such that the rejection of these claims, and of the claims that depend respectively therefrom, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as purportedly being obvious over Griffin in view of Wild and Zisman should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith to our Deposit Account No. 23/2825, under Docket No. M1103.70586US00.

Dated:

2-2-09

Respectfully submitted,

By Randy J. Pritzker
Randy J. Pritzker
Registration No.: 35,986
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
Federal Reserve Plaza
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206
617.646.8000